phytosaurs such as *Promystriosuchus* Case, 1922, *Francosuchus* Kuhn, 1932, *Ebrachosuchus* Kuhn, 1936 or *Parasuchus* as employed by Chatterjee (1978). Most of the characters suggested so far in favour of a synonymy (e.g. Westphal, 1976; Chatterjee, 1978; Ballew, 1989; Hunt & Lucas, 1991) only describe the more primitive organization relative to more advanced phytosaurs that all these taxa have in common, but do not indicate that these forms are more closely related to each other than to any other non-basal phytosaur.

Nomenclatural stability is hardly achieved by replacing a nomen dubium (*Parasuchus*, as defined by the original material) with a name of uncertain or at best debatable application (*Paleorhinus*). The application of names among basal phytosaurs must be fixed and the taxa in question need to be re-studied, before decisions on the synonymy of specific and generic names can be presented. In contrast to most other type specimens involved (with the exception of those of *Ebrachosuchus*), the proposed neotype for *Parasuchus hislopi* is well-preserved, and it is one of the very few complete phytosaur skeletons known. I recommend that the Commission use its plenary power to approve Sankar Chatterjee's proposal.

Additional reference

Westphal, F. 1976. Phytosauria. Pp. 99–120 *in* Kuhn, O. (Ed.), *Handbuch der Paläoherpetologie*, vol. 13, Thecodontia. Fischer, Stuttgart.

Comments on the proposed precedence of the specific name of *Euphryne obesus* Baird, 1858 over that of *Sauromalus ater* Duméril, 1856 (Reptilia, Sauria)

(Case 3143; see BZN **58**: 37–40)

(1) Harry L. Taylor

Biology, Regis University, 3333 Regis Boulevard, Denver, Colorado 80221–1099, U.S.A.

I support the proposal to give the name *Sauromalus obesus* (Baird, 1858) precedence over *S. ater* Duméril, 1856.

Prof Montanucci and his colleagues are to be commended for (1) an exceptionally thorough and objective evaluation of the evidence, and (2) making the herpetological community aware of the problem through two detailed publications in *Herpetological Review* (Montanucci, 2000 and 2001).

It is clear that nomenclatural stability should obtain in this case.

(2) Kenney L. Krysko

Division of Herpetology, Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, U.S.A.

I have read Case 3143. I agree with the authors and believe that they make a strong argument for using the name *Sauromalus obesus* in preference to *S. ater*.